



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILED DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/609,552	06/30/2000	Michael F. Murray		1749

7590

12/18/2002

ELLIS, VENABLE, & BUSAM LLP
3030 NORTH CENTRAL AVENUE
SUITE 702
PHOENIX, AZ 85012

EXAMINER

TRAVERS, RUSSELL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

DATE MAILED: 12/18/2002

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/609,552

Applicant(s)
Murray et al

Examiner
R.S. Travers J.D., Ph.D.

Art Unit
1617



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sep 27, 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 14-23, and 25-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 14-23, and 25-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit:

The amendment filed September 27, 2002 has been received and entered into the file.

Applicant's arguments filed September 27, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Claims 1, 14-23 and 25-29 are presented for examination.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, and thereby failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,

Art Unit:

- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence of absence of working examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

Applicant fails to set forth the criteria that defines to what effect the "effective amount of Niacin" is directed. Although various effects are recited, collateral to constructive effect, Applicant fails to recite therapeutic effect desired. Additionally, Applicant fails to provide information allowing the skilled artisan to ascertain these compound amounts without undue experimentation. In the instant case, only a limited number of "effective amount of Niacin" examples are set forth, thereby failing to provide sufficient working examples. It is noted that these examples are neither exhaustive, nor define the class of compounds required. The pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. The instant claims read on all "effective amount of Niacin" dosages, necessitating an exhaustive search for the embodiments suitable to practice the claimed invention. Applicants fail to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation.

Art Unit:

Claims 1, 14-23, and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

Claims 1, 14-23, and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 14-23, and 25-29 are rendered indefinite by the phrase and thereby failing to clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Criteria defining a medicament amount encompassing an "effective amount of Niacin" are not set forth in the specification, thereby failing to provide information defining the instant inventions metes and bounds. Applicant's term fails to clearly define the subject matter encompassed by the instant claims, thus is properly rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude

Art Unit:

patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1, 14-21, 23, 24 and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tang et al, Brown et al, in view of Murray et al, all of record.

Tang et al and Brown teach the claimed compounds as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. Elevated ingestion levels of these (see especially Brown et al, page 430, paragraph 3) medicaments are taught as significantly decreasing the progression of HIV infected individuals to AIDS. Tang et al teach the greatest benefit was significantly correlated with the highest niacin intake levels. Claims 1, 14-21, 23, 24 and 26-29, and the primary reference, differ as to:

- 1) employment to the amide form.
- 2) the employment of these medicament as anti-HIV agents,
- 3) administration levels of the medicaments, and
- 4) concomitant employment of these medicaments.

Murray et al teach nicotinamide as the form employed in-vivo; with the conversion from niacin to nicotinamide in-vivo as a normal course of events in the liver. Additionally, Murray et al teach nicotinamide, the physiologically employed form of niacin, as useful for inhibiting HIV in-vitro. Possessing this information, the skilled

Art Unit:

artisan would see the claimed niacin as an anti-HIV agent in-vivo, and view as obvious, the employment of this compound for treatment of HIV infections as obvious.

Tang et al, teaching high dietary niacin intake as associated with a positive clinical outcome for HIV infected patients, would have motivated the skilled artisan to employ high niacin levels to treat HIV infections. Additionally, determining the active ingredient dosage level required to effect optimal therapeutic benefit is well within the Skilled Artisan's purview and the benefits of achieving such maximization obvious, to said skilled artisan. The claims merely recite the obvious employment of old and well known active ingredients, carriers and excipients. Thus, the only issue presented in the instant application is the obviousness of the claimed HIV therapeutic methods

The instant claims are directed to effecting a biochemical pathway with an old and well known compound. Arguments that Applicant's claims are not directed to the old and well known ultimate utility for this compound are not probative. It is well settled patent law that mode of action elucidation fails to impart patentable moment to otherwise old and obvious subject matter. Applicant's attention is directed to In re Swinehart, (169 USPQ 226 at 229) where the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals stated "is elementary that the mere recitation of a newly discovered function or property, inherently possessed by things in the prior art, does not cause a claim drawn to those things to distinguish over the prior art.". Additionally, where the Patent Office has reason to believe that a functional limitation asserted to be critical for establishing

Art Unit:

novelty in the claimed subject matter, may in fact be an inherent characteristic of the prior art, it possesses the authority to require the applicant to prove that the subject matter shown to be in the prior art does not possess the characteristic relied on. In the instant invention, the claims are directed to the ultimate utility set forth in the prior art, albeit distanced by various biochemical intermediates. The ultimate utility for the claimed compounds is old and well known, rendering the claimed subject matter obvious to the skilled artisan. It would follow therefore that the instant claims are properly rejected under 35 USC 103.

It is generally considered prima facie obvious to combine two compounds each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. As shown by the recited teachings, the instant claims define nothing more than the concomitant use of two conventional anti-HIV agents. It would follow that the recited claims define prima facie obvious subject matter. Cf. In re Kerhoven, 626 F.2d 848, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980).

Claims 22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tang et al, Brown et al, in view of Murray et al, all of record, as set forth above in further view of Rideout et al.

Art Unit:

Rideout et al teach the claimed compounds as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in a dosage form. This medicament is taught as useful for treating inflammation, viewed by the skilled artisan as immuno-suppressive. Claims 22 and 25, and the primary reference, differ as to:

1) the concomitant employment of these medicaments.

It is generally considered prima facie obvious to combine two compounds each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. As shown by the recited teachings, the instant claims define nothing more than the concomitant use of conventional anti-HIV agents. It would follow that the recited claims define prima facie obvious subject matter. Cf. In re Kerhoven, 626 F.2d 848, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980).

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

Examiner notes verbiage reciting "effects amount" is not directed to an identifiable condition to be effected, thus, fails to meet the criteria under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs.


Rebuttal arguments presented are moot in view of the newly presented rejections.

Art Unit:

Arguments provided to rebut the obviousness rejection are unconvincing. Examiner cited prior art teaches anti-HIV therapy by administering elevated levels of niacin. Those therapeutic goals set forth in the Examiner cited prior art differ from those herein claimed not at all. Possessing the Examiner cited prior art, the skilled artisan would have been motivated to administer elevated niacin levels and enjoyed an expectation of anti-HIV therapeutic success. Niacin, therapeutically administered was reported by the Examiner cited prior art as slowing the progression of the disease, and reducing symptomology. The skilled artisan would see the niacin administration effects, and a therapeutic benefit as indistinguishable.

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Russell Travers at telephone number (703) 308-4603.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'RT', enclosed within a large, loopy oval stroke.

Russell Travers J.D., Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617